



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/606,258

06/24/2003

Mun Tutt Chin

9818-082-999

4508

48591

7590

11/16/2006

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

SAEED, USMAAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/606,258	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Usmaan Saeed	<b>Art Unit</b> 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 22-24 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-21 in the reply filed on 11/8/2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 8/17/2006 is acknowledged.  
Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 2166

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Broberg et al.** (**Broberg** hereinafter) U.S. PG Pub No. 2004/0128641 in view of **Ryo Atsumi.** (**Atsumi** hereinafter) U.S. Patent No. 5,594,639, further in view of **Carter et al.** (**Carter** hereinafter) U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0074391.

With respect to claim 1, **Broberg** teaches a method for manufacturing integrated circuits meeting customer special requirements with multiple subcontractors in remote locations, comprising the steps of:

“receiving a customer transaction file via the internet” as the processor 30 may access one or more of the generation tools, the required data, other various applications components, programs, objects, modules, etc., resident on one or more processors in another computer coupled to computer 20 via a network 18, e.g., in a distributed or client-server computing environment whereby the processing to implement the functions of the suite or one of the tools may be allocated to multiple computers over a network (**Broberg** Paragraph 0026).

**“extracting a set of customer special requirements from said transaction file”** as the suite of generation tools described herein interprets an application set, also described herein, and a customer’s requirements for an integrated circuit (**Broberg Paragraph 0028**).

**“updating a customer rule set database with the set of customer special requirements”** as the manager 732 further maintains the request order of the elements to be constructed, the physical placement detail of the customer logic from the design database 784 (**Broberg Paragraph 0055**). Examiner interprets the design database as the customer rule set database since it contains the customer logic.

**“selecting partially processed wafers identified in a die bank database in accordance with said customer rule set database”** as the resource selector 736 to provide a list of available elements which can be used to construct the requested circuit; (d) updates the resource database 734 with the complete view of generated elements for use in further optimization passes (**Broberg Paragraph 0055**). The manager 732 further maintains the request order of the elements to be constructed, the physical placement detail of the customer logic from the design database 784 (**Broberg Paragraph 0055**).

**Broberg** further teaches that the resource selector 736 references to the slice definition 714 and the resource database 734 (**Broberg Paragraph 0056**). Slice is partially manufactured semiconductor device in which the wafer layers up to the connectivity layer have been fabricated (**Broberg Paragraph 0036**).

**Broberg** teaches the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches **“validating special release requirements for said selected wafers in accordance with an assembly capability database that stores capabilities of each subcontractor”** and **“issuing electronic die release orders release for said selected wafers from a die bank to at least one of a plurality of subcontractors for further processing.”**

However, **Atsumi** discloses **“validating special release requirements for said selected wafers in accordance with an assembly capability database”** and **“issuing electronic die release orders release for said selected equipment from a database to at least one of a plurality of subcontractors for further processing”** as the dispatching processing unit 36 determines the schedule, lot, and operation priority, the load explosion processing unit 38 executes resources/lead time explosion and resources/loads explosion for individual orders and the requirements planning processing unit 40 projects the loads for individual resources, and the result of these processings is output to the order load ledger 48 and further to an external release order ledger 50. An order registered to the external release order ledger 50 becomes an order to the outside i.e., a sub-order, and it becomes an output unit to a subcontractor. Furthermore, it also functions as a report input unit for the result of a plan or the execution of the plan from the sub-order, which is registered to a progress database 46 to be described later (**Atsumi** Col 8, 63-67 & Col 9, Lines 1-9, Figure 2 & 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Atsumi's**

Art Unit: 2166

teachings would have allowed **Broberg** to provide a general-purpose order processing control module, which has an internal structure to process sequentially input actual orders and the orders are controlled while exchanging them to and from the outside.

**Broberg and Atsumi** teach the elements of claim 1 as noted above but do not explicitly teach “**capabilities of each subcontractor.**”

However, **Carter** discloses, “**capabilities of each subcontractor**” as figure 55, reference numeral 5580 (**Carter** Figure 55). The contractor capability index is stored as the performance data 170 in the database 100.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Carter’s** teachings would have allowed **Broberg and Atsumi** to determine capability index of a contractor based on contractor capabilities and history of performance index.

Claims 8 and 15 are essentially the same as claim 1 except they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program and a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 2, **Broberg** teaches “**the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:**

“**retrieving wafer data from foundry subcontractors via the Internet**” as the resource selector 736 to provide a list of available elements which can be used to construct the requested circuit (**Broberg** Paragraph 0055).

**“retrieving die bank lot details from a shop floor management system”** as the floorplan shell describes the location of the physical slice resources on the slice, particularly physical placement requirements on the transistor fabric and power grid to enable R-cell hardmac creation. The floorplan shell further has the physical placement requirements on the memories, configurable I/Os, PLL, etc. used in allocating the resources of the slice by the suite of generation tools. Thus, the shells provide proven interfaces and controllers that may be in compliance with industry standards, so the chip developer and/or the customer need only concentrate on developing their differentiating logic (**Broberg** Paragraph 0050). Examiner interprets floorplan shell as die bank lot.

**“mapping said wafer data to said die bank lot”** as the synthesis shell 858 and the floorplan shell 860 provide input to the static timing analysis shell 856. The documentation shell 862 is provided as output (**Broberg** Paragraph 0063). The documentation has the resource/(wafer data) of the slice, and the floorplan has the physical location of the resources and the data with the resources and the location is being linked/mapped by the timing analysis shell.

**“updating said die bank database with said wafer data”** as the resource selector 736 to provide a list of available elements which can be used to construct the requested circuit; (d) updates the resource database 734 with the complete view of generated elements for use in further optimization passes (**Broberg** Paragraph 0055).

**Broberg** teaches the elements of claim 2 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches **“subcontractors.”**



Art Unit: 2166

However, **Atsumi** discloses “**subcontractors**” as an order registered to the external release order ledger 50 becomes an order to the outside i.e., a sub-order, and it becomes an output unit to a sub-contractor (**Atsumi** Col 8, 63-67 & Col 9, Lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Atsumi's** teachings would have allowed **Broberg** to provide a general-purpose order processing control module, which has an internal structure to process sequentially input actual orders and the orders are controlled while exchanging them to and from the outside.

Claims 9 and 16 are essentially the same as claim 2 except they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program and a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 3, **Broberg** teaches “**the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:**

“**retrieving assembly capability data from a corporate planning system**” as the resource manager 732 has selected the candidate elements, these elements along with the customer requirement 720 are passed to the composer 738. The composer 738 generates the design views 750, i.e., the RTL, simulation array, timing constraints, synthesis scripts, for the requested design, which may be in Verilog, VHDL, or other design language selected. The composer 738 also informs the manager 732 if it is not possible to create the requested resource from the particular slice (**Broberg** Paragraph

Art Unit: 2166

0057). Examiner interprets the RTL, simulation array, timing constraints, synthesis scripts, for the requested design as assembly capability data.

**“retrieving manufacturing document data from a document control system”**

as a documentation shell provides templates to interface with the suite of generation tools and may provide an interface by which the user module can be compatibly input to the suite. Typically, the documentation shell may include the resources of slice including the total I/Os and memories available, the I/Os and memories available after assignment and generation, the interface timing diagrams, and the block functional specifications (**Broberg** Paragraph 0049). Examiner interprets document shell as to include data for manufacturing.

**“updating said assembly capability database”** as updates the resource database 734 with the complete view of generated elements for use in further optimization passes (**Broberg** Paragraph 0055).

**Broberg** teaches the elements of claim 3 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches **“assembly capability database.”**

However, **Atsumi** discloses **“assembly capability database”** as a report input unit for the result of a plan or the execution of the plan from the sub-order, which is registered to a progress database 46 to be described later (**Atsumi** Col 8, 63-67 & Col 9, Lines 1-9). Examiner interprets the progress database as the assembly capability database.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Atsumi’s**

Art Unit: 2166

teachings would have allowed **Broberg** to provide a general-purpose order processing control module, which has an internal structure to process sequentially input actual orders and the orders are controlled while exchanging them to and from the outside.

Claims 10 and 17 are essentially the same as claim 3 except they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program and a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 4, **Broberg** teaches **“the method of claim 1, wherein selecting wafers in a die bank database further comprises the steps of:**

**“identifying wafers that meet customer special requirements in accordance with information obtained from a wafer test system”** as surrounding the RTL logic of the generated module 410 is the user module 420. Any customer logic provided will be inserted in the user module 420 and will be conditioned by an RTL analysis tool to implement the customer's logic quickly. An example of such an RTL analysis tool is TERAFORM, a commercially available tool that identifies potential timing and design closure issues of the customer's specification early in the design cycle. Also included in the user module 420 are instantiated diffused and R-cell memory and their corresponding wrappers, and registers, and a list of ports having tie-offs, i.e., the list of I/O ports that will not be used. These memory, registers, and list of ports can be generated by one of the suite of generation tools or may be provided as part of the customer requirements (**Broberg** Paragraph 0042).

**“tagging said wafers”** as the resource selector 736 to provide a list of available elements which can be used to construct the requested circuit (**Broberg** Paragraph 0055).

**“updating said die bank database”** as the resource selector 736 to provide a list of available elements which can be used to construct the requested circuit; (d) updates the resource database 734 with the complete view of generated elements for use in further optimization passes (**Broberg** Paragraph 0055).

Claims 11 and 18 are essentially the same as claim 4 except they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program and a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 5, **Broberg** teaches the method of claim 1, wherein **validating special release parameters comprises the steps of:**

**“retrieving customer special release details from said customer rule set database”** as the manager 732 further maintains the request order of the elements to be constructed, the physical placement detail of the customer logic from the design database 784 (**Broberg** Paragraph 0055). Examiner interprets the design database as the customer rule set database since it contains the customer logic.

**“retrieving assembly capabilities of subcontractors from said assembly capability database”** as the resource manager 732 has selected the candidate elements, these elements along with the customer requirement 720 are passed to the

Art Unit: 2166

composer 738. The composer 738 generates the design views 750, i.e., the RTL, simulation array, timing constraints, synthesis scripts, for the requested design, which may be in Verilog, VHDL, or other design language selected. The composer 738 also informs the manager 732 if it is not possible to create the requested resource from the particular slice (**Broberg** Paragraph 0057). Examiner interprets the RTL, simulation array, timing constraints, synthesis scripts, for the requested design as assembly capability data.

**Broberg** teaches the elements of claim 5 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches “**release orders**”, “**assembly capability database**” and “**validating said customer special release details against said assembly capabilities of subcontractors.**”

However, **Atsumi** discloses “**release orders**”, “**assembly capability database**” as the dispatching processing unit 36 determines the schedule, lot, and operation priority, the load explosion processing unit 38 executes resources/lead time explosion and resources/loads explosion for individual orders and the requirements planning processing unit 40 projects the loads for individual resources, and the result of these processings is output to the order load ledger 48 and further to an external release order ledger 50. An order registered to the external release order ledger 50 becomes an order to the outside i.e., a sub-order, and it becomes an output unit to a sub-contractor. Furthermore, it also functions as a report input unit for the result of a plan or the execution of the plan from the sub-order, which is registered to a progress database 46 to be described later (**Atsumi** Col 8, 63-67 & Col 9, Lines 1-9). Examiner

Art Unit: 2166

interprets the progress database as the assembly capability database. and **“validating said customer special release details against said assembly capabilities of subcontractors”** as wherein the dispatching processing unit 36 receives an order generated as a result of the explosion of orders into component requirements and determines the date of the starting point or ending point of the order, and the load explosion processing unit 38 generates a process sequence by using a process chart and explodes the load for the individual resources and inputs the same to the requirements planning processing unit 40 to plan the load for the respective resources such as equipments, manpower, tools, jigs, orders to sub-contractors, and the like (**Atsumi** Col 4, Lines 41-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Atsumi's** teachings would have allowed **Broberg** to provide a general-purpose order processing control module, which has an internal structure to process sequentially input actual orders and the orders are controlled while exchanging them to and from the outside.

Claims 12 and 19 are essentially the same as claim 5 except they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program and a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 6, **Broberg teaches the method of claim 1, wherein issuing electronic die release orders to a plurality of subcontractors comprises the steps of:**

**“electronic data and internet”** as the processor 30 may access one or more of the generation tools, the required data, other various applications components, programs, objects, modules, etc., resident on one or more processors in another computer coupled to computer 20 via a network 18, e.g., in a distributed or client-server computing environment whereby the processing to implement the functions of the suite or one of the tools may be allocated to multiple computers over a network (**Broberg Paragraph 0026**).

**Broberg** teaches the elements of claim 6 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches **“generating die release order file for said selected wafers and said validated special release requirements”** and **“transferring said electronic die release order file to subcontractors”** as the dispatching processing unit 36 determines the schedule, lot, and operation priority, the load explosion processing unit 38 executes resources/lead time explosion and resources/loads explosion for individual orders and the requirements planning processing unit 40 projects the loads for individual resources, and the result of these processings is output to the order load ledger 48 and further to an external release order ledger 50. An order registered to the external release order ledger 50 becomes an order to the outside i.e., a sub-order, and it becomes an output unit to a sub-contractor. Furthermore, it also functions as a report input unit for the result of a plan or the execution of the plan from the sub-order, which is

Art Unit: 2166

registered to a progress database 46 to be described later (**Atsumi** Col 8, 63-67 & Col 9, Lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Atsumi's** teachings would have allowed **Broberg** to provide a general-purpose order processing control module, which has an internal structure to process sequentially input actual orders and the orders are controlled while exchanging them to and from the outside.

Claims 13 and 20 are essentially the same as claim 6 except they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program and a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

4. Claims 7, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Broberg et al.** U.S. PG Pub No. 2004/0128641, in view of **Ryo Atsumi**. U.S. Patent No. 5,594,639, further in view of **Carter et al.** U.S. PG Pub No. 2003/0074391 as applied to claim 1-6, 8-13, and 15-20 above, further in view of **Sedra et al.** (**Sedra** hereinafter) (NPL "Microelectronic circuits" Oxford University Press 1998 Pages 354-358).

With respect to claim 7, **Broberg** teaches "the method of claim 1, wherein said customer special requirements contain at least one parameter selected from the group consisting of n-channel breakdown voltage, n-channel saturation



**current, p-channel saturation current, n-channel threshold voltage, p-channel threshold voltage, yield before bake and yield after bake**” as the resource selector 736 performs a local optimization across a weighting of the parameters and builds a list of elements to support the requested design (**Broberg** Paragraph 0056).

**Broberg** teaches the elements of claim 7 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches “**group consisting of n-channel breakdown voltage, n-channel saturation current, p-channel saturation current, n-channel threshold voltage, p-channel threshold voltage, yield before bake and yield after bake.**”

However, **Sedra** discloses “**group consisting of n-channel breakdown voltage, n-channel saturation current, p-channel saturation current, n-channel threshold voltage, p-channel threshold voltage, yield before bake and yield after bake**” as current is conducted by only one type carrier (electrons or hole) depending on the type of FET (n channel or p channel) (**Sedra** Page 354).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Sedra's** teachings would have allowed **Atsumi, Broberg and Carter** to manufacture the integrated circuits according to customer's requirements in an efficient and timely manner by the use of these parameters.

Claims 14 and 21 are essentially the same as claim 7 except they set forth the claimed invention as a computer program and a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. A detailed discussion is set forth herein below.

Regarding claims, 1, 8, and 15 applicant argues that **Broberg and Atsumi** do not teach **“selecting partially processed wafers identified in a die bank database in accordance with said customer rule set database,” “validating special release requirements for said selected wafers in accordance with an assembly capability database that stores capabilities of each subcontractor” and “issuing electronic die release orders release for said selected wafers from a die bank to at least one of a plurality of subcontractors for further processing.”**

In these arguments applicant relies on the amended claims and not the original ones.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that **Broberg** teaches **“selecting partially processed wafers identified in a die bank database in accordance with said customer rule set database”** as the resource selector 736 to provide a list of available elements which can be used to construct the requested circuit; (d) updates the resource database 734 with the complete view of generated elements for use in further optimization passes (**Broberg** Paragraph 0055).

Art Unit: 2166

The manager 732 further maintains the request order of the elements to be constructed, the physical placement detail of the customer logic from the design database 784 (**Broberg** Paragraph 0055).

**Broberg** further teaches that the resource selector 736 references to the slice definition 714 and the resource database 734 (**Broberg** Paragraph 0056). Slice is partially manufactured semiconductor device in which the wafer layers up to the connectivity layer have been fabricated (**Broberg** Paragraph 0036).

**Broberg** teaches the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches **“validating special release requirements for said selected wafers in accordance with an assembly capability database that stores capabilities of each subcontractor”** and **“issuing electronic die release orders release for said selected wafers from a die bank to at least one of a plurality of subcontractors for further processing.”**

However, **Atsumi** discloses **“validating special release requirements for said selected wafers in accordance with an assembly capability database”** and **“issuing electronic die release orders release for said selected equipment from a database to at least one of a plurality of subcontractors for further processing”** as the dispatching processing unit 36 determines the schedule, lot, and operation priority, the load explosion processing unit 38 executes resources/lead time explosion and resources/loads explosion for individual orders and the requirements planning processing unit 40 projects the loads for individual resources, and the result of these processings is output to the order load ledger 48 and further to an external release

Art Unit: 2166

order ledger 50. An order registered to the external release order ledger 50 becomes an order to the outside i.e., a sub-order, and it becomes an output unit to a sub-contractor. Furthermore, it also functions as a report input unit for the result of a plan or the execution of the plan from the sub-order, which is registered to a progress database 46 to be described later (**Atsumi** Col 8, 63-67 & Col 9, Lines 1-9, Figure 2 & 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Atsumi's** teachings would have allowed **Broberg** to provide a general-purpose order processing control module, which has an internal structure to process sequentially input actual orders and the orders are controlled while exchanging them to and from the outside.

**Broberg and Atsumi** teach the elements of claim 1 as noted above but do not explicitly teach "**capabilities of each subcontractor.**"

However, **Carter** discloses, "**capabilities of each subcontractor**" as figure 55, reference numeral 5580 (**Carter** Figure 55). The contractor capability index is stored as the performance data 170 in the database 100.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Carter's** teachings would have allowed **Broberg and Atsumi** to determine capability index of a contractor based on contractor capabilities and history of performance index.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 2166

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usmaan Saeed whose telephone number is (571)272-4046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2166

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Usmaan Saeed  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2166

Leslie Wong   
Primary Examiner

US  
November 9, 2006

  
**HOSAIN ALAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**